

## Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed the above-referenced case on July 26, 2006. Claims 1-11, 13-25, 27 and 28 are standing for examination. Claims 1-11, 13-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. Claims 1-11, 13-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Atsmon et al. (U.S. 6,607,136), hereinafter Atsmon. Claims 3-11, 13, 14, 17-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and being unpatentable over Atsmon in view of Saitoh (U.S. 5,929,414), hereinafter Saitoh.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's objection, rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. Regarding the 112 rejections, applicant herein amends Fig. 1 along with the specification to particularly point out a secure memory device for use with and contained within a smart card. There is clearly disclosure for the smartcard in applicant's specification as evidenced in the title, background, summary and claims. Therefore, applicant is not adding new matter when disclosing the smartcard in the drawings and the specification. Claim 2 is amended to clarify the language.

Regarding the 102 rejection of applicant's independent claims 1 and 15, the Examiner states that Atsmon teaches an ISO 7816 interface (column 25, lines 12, 13); a one-wire modem interface (transducer; column 11, lines 37-39); characterized in that both communication interfaces are bidirectional and share the same I/O terminal (input/output unit 35, figure 3; column 11, lines 36-40).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Atsmon. Figure 3 of Atsmon clearly shows input/output unit 35 containing reception unit 32 (1 way reception) and transmission unit 33 (1 way transmission). This does not read on applicant's claims an ISO 7816 interface; a one-wire modem interface; characterized in that both communication interfaces are bidirectional and share the same I/O terminal.

Therefore the 102 rejection relying upon Atsmon fails.

Independent claims 1 and 15 are clearly patentable over the art of Atsmon as argued above. Dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, 16-25, and 27-28 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as dependent upon a patentable base claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Vicente Cedric Colnot

By *Donald R. Boys*  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076